

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

AND

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORIES

+ + + + +

PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING
FOR THE DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR ALTERNATIVE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT
AND ALTERNATIVE USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES
ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
APRIL 26, 2007

7:00 P.M.

+ + + + +

Salons B & C
Marriott Boston Hotel
2345 Commonwealth Avenue
Newton, Massachusetts

BEFORE: JOHN GASPER
Moderator

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(7:20 p.m.)

(Whereupon, at 7:20 p.m., following a period of introductory remarks, public comment was accepted.)

MR. GASPER: We'll move to your part of the program, this is your opportunity to make comments on the Draft Programmatic EIS. Before we get started though, I would like to make one announcement. You may have noticed in the back of the room we've got a camera and a person manning that camera, that's Yahoo.com back there and they are here on their own accord recording the meeting. So, just in case you are curious what's going on, that's what it is.

But moving to the intent of this part of the meeting, this is when we take your comments, there are several ways of doing that. Actually, we'll take comments in any way, shape or form that you want to give them, but probably the three most effective ways are either via the Internet, which Maureen mentioned, or in writing and you can submit written comments, as Maureen mentioned, via the mail or through the website, or there are comment forms out on the registration table. If you want to use those forms,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 fine. If not, use whatever you would like, fill them
2 out and just hand them tonight to anyone who is
3 wearing one of these name tags and we'll make sure
4 they get entered into the record.

5 The second way of commenting here tonight
6 is orally. We ask that you, if you haven't already
7 and you want to comment tonight, please go out to the
8 registration table and sign up, we'll be taking
9 speakers in the order in which they did sign up. If
10 anybody, at the end of the meeting, if everyone has
11 had a chance to speak that signed up, then we'll open
12 the floor to anyone else who may have decided they
13 have something to offer.

14 And all the comments will be recorded
15 tonight, we have a Court Reporter, so we'll be trying
16 to get down verbatim what it is you want to contribute
17 to the environmental impact statement. Along that
18 line, when it is time to comment, if you would please
19 come up to the podium, speak into the microphone and
20 start your comments with your name, and if you have an
21 affiliation, that affiliation, so that the Court
22 Reporter can get your name and affiliation associated
23 with your comments in a proper manner.

24 Also, we have several people who have
25 asked to comment tonight, there may be others, so, at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 least initially, we are asking that you keep your
2 comments to three minutes. After everyone has had a
3 chance to comment, if you would like to get back up
4 and elaborate, that will be fine, but at least
5 initially, please keep your comments to three minutes.

6 And as an aid to doing that, I've got a
7 stop watch up here. I'll set that when you start
8 talking and you'll here it go off after three minutes,
9 and additional, I have a few additional aids over here
10 too. If you go much beyond three minutes, you get a
11 yellow flag. If you go much more beyond that, you get
12 a red flag and then you get two red flags, and then I
13 guess it will be a surprise what happens after that.

14 So, and finally, when you are commenting
15 tonight, we would like you to limit your comments to
16 the programmatic EIS. There is certainly a lot on
17 many people's minds concerning the development of
18 alternative energy in many different parts of the
19 country, but tonight we are really focusing on the
20 programmatic EIS, the one that was published back on
21 March the 16th, that focuses on the MMS requirement to
22 develop its regulatory program for the whole
23 continental shelf of the United States.

24 So, without any further ado, we'll head
25 right on to the first speaker. The first speaker is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 James Liedell from Clean Power Now.

2 MR. LIEDELL: My name is James Liedell,
3 I'm on the Board of Directors of Clean Power Now, a
4 grassroots renewable energy organization, and I live
5 in Yarmouthport on Cape Cod.

6 First, I commend MMS on its Alternate
7 Energy Programmatic EIS, I have reviewed in detail the
8 sections pertaining to wind as an OCS alternative
9 energy technology, I find the methodology to be easily
10 understood and comprehensive, the characterization of
11 impacts into the four levels of negligible, minor,
12 moderate and major to be concise and clearly described
13 and the five project phases of technology testing,
14 site characterization, construction, operation and
15 decommissioning to be a very useful approach.

16 I also believe that table 1.6-1, which
17 lists responsible federal agencies and summarizes
18 pertinent provisions of the applicable statute or
19 executive order, to be very useful for future
20 applicants. Relative to this last point, I was asked
21 yesterday by a technical group, will future wind
22 turbines be approved more quickly than the Cape Wind
23 project? I answered that I feel MMS's new
24 programmatic process should reduce the cycle time for
25 investigation and approval, I feel it will and I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 very hopeful that MMS will prove me right.

2 My second comment has to do with timing
3 and the urgency associated with this, and I'm going to
4 use Cape Wind as an example of that. I ask that you
5 expedite all the EIS's that come before you. Cape
6 Wind's first application was submitted in the Fall of
7 2001, so their review has already been underway for
8 five and a half years. After MMS became the project's
9 primary federal reviewing agency in August, 2005, MMS
10 stated, in January, 2006, that the Cape Wind DEIS
11 would be issued for public comment last spring.
12 Subsequently, MMS spokesmen changed the issuance date
13 to Winter, 2006, then Spring, 2007, then, most
14 recently, to this summer, a year and a quarter and
15 still counting.

16 Meanwhile, Cape Cod and nearby areas have
17 been waiting to receive the economic health and other
18 large benefits from this project. I urgently request
19 that MMS and those further reviewing your DEIS
20 expeditiously complete and issue it. The Cape Wind
21 project will alleviate many problems such as high
22 electricity rates, global warming, national security.
23 It is needed soon, rather than later.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The second speaker is Charles Kleekamp,
2 also with Clean Power Now.

3 MR. KLEEKAMP: Thank you very much. My
4 name is Charles Kleekamp.

5 It looks like you are well on your way
6 with a well thought out draft EIS. With respect to
7 your discussion on visual impacts in chapters four and
8 five, allow me to comment. I would certainly agree
9 that the number of viewers is important in an
10 assessment, as well as the view sheds from seaside
11 residences. However, the argument regarding any
12 individual's specific opinion of wind turbines is not
13 only subjective but intractable, some consider them
14 ugly, others majestic. Ex-Governor Romney said I have
15 seen wind farms and they are not pretty, another can
16 say wind turbines are exquisite monuments of grace and
17 power.

18 As such, I feel these arguments should not
19 be considered in assessing visual impacts or play a
20 role in the determination of a permit for an offshore
21 wind farm, your reference page 119, chapter five.
22 More important than the visual impact is to consider
23 the environmental justice as you address in chapter
24 four, and that is to disproportionately burden
25 minority populations with environmental effects of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 proposed developments. The case of environment view
2 shed, for example, the influence of property owners of
3 very expensive seaside residences should not override
4 considered view shed of properties of minority
5 populations.

6 For example, some may say I agree with the
7 need for offshore wind farms but, please, put it
8 somewhere else, like off the coast of New Bedford or
9 Fall River. The emotional and nostalgic feelings of
10 NIMBY owners must not override the environmental
11 justice. To say that any one ocean view is more or
12 less desirable than any other is unfair. Unlike
13 terrestrial historic sites, all ocean views are
14 equally exquisite. To paraphrase an old nursery
15 rhyme, I would say window, window on the wall, whose
16 view is most expensive of all?

17 If we all agree that offshore wind power
18 is important to our national interest, then a
19 particular view of a wind farm in the OCS should not
20 be a determining factor in the assessment of a permit.
21 After all, the visual size of turbines at three miles
22 would be less than an inch high when measured with a
23 ruler held at arm's length. And in concluding, I
24 would say with 12 offshore operational wind farms in
25 Northern Europe now and a surge of 10 more that are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 under construction now or next year means that
2 offshore wind is a maturing technology, we must move
3 on.

4 Thank you very much.

5 (Applause)

6 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

7 Next speaker, John Roberts, from the Union
8 of Concerned Scientists.

9 MR. ROGERS: Actually, that's John Rogers.

10 MR. GASPER: I'm sorry, John Rogers.

11 MR. ROGERS: Thank you very much for the
12 opportunity to appear this evening. My name is John
13 Rogers and I am a senior energy analyst at the Union
14 of Concerned Scientists, the leading science-based
15 nonprofit working for a health environment and a safer
16 world. Our clean energy program analyzed the costs
17 and benefits of clean energy technologies and
18 policies, including their value in decreasing
19 emissions and combatting global warming.

20 We appreciate MMS's responsibility to
21 develop a process to ensure that offshore energy
22 projects receive thorough environmental reviews, all
23 energy alternatives have impacts and every resource,
24 project and site deserves serious scrutiny of
25 potential environmental impacts and how they can be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 mitigated. We also appreciate and very much agree
2 with MMS's acknowledgement in the programmatic EIS of
3 the implications of delays in the development of
4 renewable energy facilities in the OCS, that the
5 electricity they would otherwise be producing would
6 have to come instead from coal, gas or nuclear
7 facilities, for example, with negative implications
8 for our environment and our national security.

9 In developing standards for future
10 projects, the most important objective should be to
11 ensure that all sources be held to comparable high
12 standards, new sources, like offshore wind, should not
13 be held to more rigorous standards regarding their
14 impacts than energy resources such as offshore oil and
15 gas, the playing field must be as level as possible to
16 ensure that we make the best energy choices possible.
17 We also appreciate MMS's efforts and the constraints,
18 financial and personnel, for carrying out this work.

19 Consistent with the notion of the level
20 playing field and the acknowledgement of the damaging
21 effects of delays, however, we urge that MMS finalize
22 the programmatic EIS as quickly as possible. And we
23 strongly urge that MMS continue, in parallel, the
24 process of evaluating projects already in the MMS
25 pipeline and speedily complete those evaluations. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are particularly concerned that the process for those
2 projects not be held up by the broader programmatic
3 EIS.

4 Our position, broadly stated, is that
5 offshore wind projects, such as Cape Wind, should be
6 built unless less rigorous review and study shows
7 significant environmental impacts that cannot be
8 mitigated and that outweigh project benefits. The
9 programmatic and project EISs should include full
10 consideration of those benefits, along with assessment
11 of impacts. We believe that with proper siting,
12 careful design, comprehensive study, monitoring and
13 mitigation, wind power and other renewable energy
14 projects can and should play a significant role in
15 meeting the country's electricity needs and in
16 responding to the serious challenge of global warming.

17 Section 3.88 of the Energy Policy Act
18 clearly states that MMS's OCS alternative energy
19 activities should be carried out "in a manner that
20 provides for the protection of the environment, the
21 prevention of waste and the protection of national
22 security interests of the United States". Given the
23 implications for the development of particular
24 projects and the entire offshore renewable energy
25 sector, speedy resolution of the programmatic and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 project EISS would seem to be mandated by that
2 legislation and by the environmental and security
3 interests of our country.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

6 Our next speaker is Barbara Durkin.

7 MS. DURKIN: My name is Barbara Durkin, I
8 appreciate this opportunity to speak to you this
9 evening as a concerned private citizen with no view,
10 I'm not a NIMBY, I live in Central Massachusetts. I
11 am particularly concerned at the level of deference
12 MMS has given the industry, given to industry in the
13 development of the draft DPEIS. Federal agencies have
14 the duty to look out for the best interest of the
15 environment, to be the counterweight that prevents
16 private interests from exploiting federal resources to
17 the detriment of the public trust.

18 The DPEIS has failed to meet this public
19 interest, excuse me, this public trust obligation.
20 Instead, the scope of the review is dictated by
21 current industry objectives. The time frame and
22 technologies included in the draft PEIS both revolve
23 around current industry targets, the draft PEIS
24 wrongly defers comment on important issues which
25 impact the whole OCS resource.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MMS has sidestepped topics such as
2 cumulative impacts and the development of exclusion
3 zones, putting them off until industry has decided
4 where and how it would like to proceed, but congress
5 did not task industry with managing the development of
6 the OCS, rather Section 3.88 of the Energy Policy Act
7 mandated that the Department of Interior do so.

8 The deference that MMS has given the
9 industry violates both the agency's public trust
10 obligation and congressional intent. In particular,
11 MMS's re-review on this section, and this is what I
12 would hope for, of the scope of the PEIS purpose and
13 need statement, and I would like to remind MMS of the
14 need for objective standards for a review. I'm also
15 concerned about our observation of industry wisdom
16 reflecting in siting guideline recommendations of the
17 Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
18 Service, GreenPeace, Sierra Club, American Bird
19 Conservancy and Mass Audobon avoid areas in siting
20 wind towers that have a con, that will conflict with
21 endangered species.

22 And I would ask that you also consider
23 contacting the former AG of California, Bill Locklear,
24 who would be able to provide a wealth of information
25 relative to the Altimonte Pass wind resource area,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 also others like Henning Gastrip of Denmark, offshore
2 wind pioneer, who could give you a great description
3 of the economic adverse impact of wildlife deaths,
4 particularly birds, and that it's an economic setback
5 that adversely effects improperly sited wind towers,
6 and I ask you to pay close attention to that, the
7 conflicts.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

10 The next speaker, David Barclay, from the
11 Northeast Sustainable Energy Association.

12 MR. BARCLAY: Thank you. My name is David
13 Barclay, I do represent the Northeast Sustainable
14 Energy Association, we are located in Western
15 Massachusetts but we cover a territory that ranges
16 from Maine to Maryland, covering roughly 40 percent of
17 the U.S. population.

18 Our perspective here, like yours, is to
19 look at whole energy systems, it is particularly
20 important, from our perspective, that we look for real
21 solutions as we try to address the energy demands that
22 confront us. As someone who has sat for a full decade
23 of my career on your side of this table, I would tell
24 you that I appreciate the job that you are attempting
25 to do.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I think that our perspective, as it
2 relates to looking specifically at the draft
3 programmatic environmental impact statement, is that
4 the steps in the process we think are logical and
5 thoughtful and laid out, there is also an
6 acknowledgement, which we think is accurate, of the
7 relatively minimal impact of wind, as it relates to
8 other types of energy production. We think that that
9 is also appropriate, but we also have some particular
10 concerns and those are that, in addition to being
11 objective, we think that sound programmatic
12 environmental impact statement should be guided by two
13 overriding criteria and those criteria are that the
14 process needs to proceed at a regular pace, a
15 reasonable pace, and secondly, that the analysis that
16 occurs in that process should not duplicate analysis
17 that has already occurred.

18 So, as it relates to reasonable pace, we
19 are particularly concerned about the pace with which
20 this draft environmental impact statement has
21 proceeded and the resulting impact that that will have
22 on developing wind projects and on Cape Wind in
23 particular. The 19 or the 2005 Energy Policy Act,
24 contained in it we think are the clear sense of
25 urgency about that programmatic and site specific

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 considerations be addressed within a reasonable time
2 frame, the delay for developing this because of I
3 think what you are trying to take on has slipped and
4 that has had significant impacts on Cape Wind and will
5 have significant impacts on other wind developers, if
6 it occurs again.

7 The concurrent work on the Cape Wind
8 project has also been related, has been delayed, as
9 the prior speaker indicated, and by any measure, the
10 pace of this process has been troubling. It's
11 particularly troubling in the face of potentially
12 catastrophic consequences of delays in our ability to
13 shift our power production from greenhouse gas
14 emitting sources and fossil fuels to clean energy
15 sources, such as wind power.

16 The second thing that I mentioned with
17 regard to redundancy of analysis is this, the decision
18 by MMS to produce its own environmental impact
19 statement regarding Cape Wind has had the effect of
20 largely duplicating the prior work that has been done
21 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other
22 agencies, seventeen of which I believe were involved
23 in that process.

24 And it should be noted that the Corp's
25 schedule, if it had been followed, that this decision

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 would have been made by approximately now. That is a
2 particularly significant statement and not a small
3 consideration, I think. In an era of rapidly rising
4 worldwide demand, energy demand, we have real choices
5 to make. Often it is ignored in discussions of this
6 type the kind of consequence of alternate energy uses,
7 and in particular, as it relates to fossil fuel and
8 the impact of those. The current energy use patterns
9 will lead to more environmental degradation,
10 international tension and economic uncertainty.

11 In our view, the clean energy production
12 on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf is perhaps the
13 single most important and positive energy development
14 ever proposed in the Northeastern United States and we
15 would urge you to accelerate this process and to use
16 the analysis that has already been complete here and
17 is available through the European installations of
18 these types of wind farms. We would urge you to
19 support Cape Wind and to move this process forward as
20 quickly as you can.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

23 Next speaker, Susan Nickerson, Save our
24 Sound.

25 MS. NICKERSON: Good evening. Thank you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 very much for allowing us the opportunity to testify
2 here tonight before you. My name is Susan Nickerson
3 and I serve as the Executive Director for the Alliance
4 to Protect Nantucket Sound.

5 The PEIS must support the proactive
6 management of the outer continental shelf, the need
7 for an OCS-wide strategic plan has been explicitly
8 detailed in the Pew oceans report. In testimony
9 before congress just two days ago, an entire panel of
10 experts ranging from environmental organizations,
11 alternative energy industry representatives, fishing
12 industry representatives and technical resource
13 experts all agreed that the establishment of strategic
14 development zones is useful for encouraging
15 alternative energy and protecting environmental
16 resources on the OCS, and that such strategic zoning
17 should take place.

18 In addition, the international trend in
19 strategic management of wind development is clearly
20 toward the establishment of exclusion zones and
21 development zones and guidelines that move projects
22 further offshore in order to mitigate impacts. As an
23 MMS staff person noted in an e-mail about siting
24 trends internationally, and I quote here, "countries
25 with a few years of wind farms under their belts,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and the U.K., are
2 where areas are being identified for wind farms and
3 they are being pushed further offshore to minimize
4 impacts".

5 These countries are doing what MMS should
6 have done in the PEIS, they are taking the time and
7 committing the necessary resources to study the
8 environment and make proactive decisions about where
9 and how construction should take place from the
10 perspective of the public interest. Protection of
11 Nantucket Sound is a perfect example of why MMS needs
12 to follow the lead of nations with robust offshore
13 wind programs and conduct a similar national review of
14 ocean resources. There is no question that if MMS
15 were to conduct a national resource review, as so many
16 other countries are doing, that we would not be
17 considering development in a place like Nantucket
18 Sound.

19 There is no more dramatic example of an
20 area that should be considered an exclusion zone than
21 Nantucket Sound. On every conceivable factor for
22 exclusion, ecological concerns, economic impacts on
23 local communities, public safety, navigation,
24 aviation, historic and cultural resources, recreation,
25 aesthetics, fishing and many others, Nantucket Sound

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 should be precluded from development.

2 As a nonprofit environment defense
3 organization stated before congress earlier this week,
4 the choice of place is key to getting this right, but
5 the current draft PEIS does not provide the
6 information necessary for MMS to make these important
7 siting decisions.

8 In the interest of proper ocean
9 management, environmental protection and the efficient
10 and timely development of offshore wind energy
11 projects, MMS should follow the model that has worked
12 in Europe, only then can the government strategically
13 advance alternative energy development and protect
14 environmental resources to the benefit of the public
15 trust.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

18 Next speaker, Charles Vinick, Alliance to
19 Protect Nantucket Sound.

20 MR. VINICK: Thank you. Good evening. My
21 name is Charles Vinick and, on behalf of the Alliance
22 to Protect Nantucket Sound, I thank you for the
23 opportunity to comment.

24 Since 2002, the alliance has been calling
25 for an OCS-wide renewable energy program based on a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 programmatic environmental impact statement which
2 could inform regulations and help manage the OCS
3 resource as a whole. We wholeheartedly agree with the
4 draft PEIS evaluation that having programmatic
5 regulations is better than not having them. We are
6 concerned, however, that this was the extent of the
7 evaluation MMS conducted.

8 The scope of the draft PEIS fails to
9 address the relevant NEPA question, MMS is tasked with
10 assessing the environmental impacts of specific
11 regulations that are being proposed by the agency.
12 Instead, the draft PEIS focuses almost exclusively on
13 the question of whether or not there should be any
14 national regulations. As a result, the draft PEIS is
15 insufficient for informing or addressing agency
16 decisions regarding the national regulations currently
17 under development. For example, the draft PEIS
18 provides only generic assessments of alternative
19 energy and its potential impacts, it presumes
20 mitigation of harms but does not discuss mitigation
21 techniques in detail or compare the strengths and
22 weaknesses of existing mitigation options.

23 It emphasizes proper siting of facilities
24 but does not define what that means. It includes, at
25 best, minimal and incomplete baseline information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 about sensitive resources across the OCS, it provides
2 nothing regarding potential conflicting public uses of
3 the waters. In short, the current draft PEIS does not
4 inform the regulation of the OCS resource in a useful
5 way. Instead of helping to inform and move forward
6 the streamlining of project review and production of
7 environmental resources, the PEIS just discusses the
8 regulations benefits.

9 Because it fails to inform or address the
10 impact of specific national regulations, either the
11 draft PEIS would need to be redone or a second PEIS
12 will be required to address the draft regulations when
13 they are published. As it is still in draft form and
14 there is time to correct the current draft, the
15 alliance calls upon MMS to supplement the draft PEIS
16 and produce a document which can inform specific
17 national regulations for development of alternative
18 energy on the OCS and the protection of the
19 environment. For specific issues which need to be
20 addressed in the supplemental, I refer you to the
21 alliance's comments of May, 2006 on the scope and to
22 our comments in response to the advanced notice of
23 proposed rule making submitted in February, 2006.

24 In addition, MMS needs to defer action on
25 all wind energy projects until after the regulations

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and the properly developed PEIS are complete. It is
2 arbitrary and capricious in the extreme to consider
3 the first and largest project in the U.S. before the
4 underlying program is in place. Cape Wind has no
5 exemption from the offshore program and conducting a
6 concurrent review can only result in uninformed
7 decision making.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

10 Next speaker, William Stavey, Ocean Wave
11 Energy Company. Okay, Mr. Stavey is waiting.

12 Next speaker, Michael Ernst, TetraTech.

13 MR. ERNST: Thank you. My name is Michael
14 Ernst, I'm a senior energy consultant at TetraTech at
15 EC, Incorporated, which provides consulting services
16 to offshore and on shore developers of wind and other
17 energy projects nationwide from off the coast of
18 Delaware across the country to Hawaii, and I
19 appreciate the opportunity to speak to you tonight.

20 I commend you for the comprehensive nature
21 of the MMS draft PEIS, I believe that, in over 600
22 pages, you have addressed each of the specific topics
23 that were mentioned earlier in a fair initial review
24 in terms of the potential impacts and mitigation
25 measures.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And I think that you have also, the staff
2 has clearly done other research, your technical white
3 paper on offshore wind energy potential addresses many
4 of these issues and, combined with the staff review
5 and other agency review of other projects and
6 specifically the Cape Wind DEIS, I think that you have
7 a substantial amount of information that the staff has
8 reviewed to move expeditiously ahead. Particularly,
9 since you have determined, I think appropriately, that
10 each new offshore wind farm will require a site
11 specific review and approval, you have provided the
12 guidance, in terms of mitigation, that I think is the
13 primary purpose of the PEIS.

14 And it's time to move ahead, so I want to
15 add my voice to those who encourage you to
16 expeditiously move ahead with a final PEIS and with
17 the draft and final rules. As you know, Section 3.88
18 of EPACT required you to establish DOI and by
19 delegation you to are establish policies and
20 procedures to result in expedited exploration and
21 development of the OCS and to make such resources
22 available to meet the nation's energy needs as rapidly
23 as possible. I think you have done a comprehensive
24 job over the past couple of years of reviewing these
25 issues and it's time to move ahead.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 It's particularly important to also,
2 because you are reviewing applications on a site
3 specific basis, to consider accepting new proposals
4 for projects, and in particular, applications for
5 meteorological towers which only utilize a few several
6 yards of seabed of a minimal impact. As you may know,
7 the Army Corps has a general nationwide permit for
8 scientific measuring devices which they consider
9 appropriate for similar scientific devices. Because
10 of the very limited impact and the fact that you would
11 be reviewing these applications on a case specific
12 basis to make sure that they are not inappropriately
13 located, it is something that is important to moving
14 the industry ahead while you are completing your
15 regulations and accepting and reviewing the full
16 applications.

17 I think the site specific review and the
18 fact that you are covering so many comprehensive
19 issues in your review means that we do not have to
20 wait and have, look at strategic zones. In your
21 review, the review of Cape Wind and other projects,
22 everybody is looking at the specific constraints, we
23 know what those constraints are. You have the
24 cooperation and participation of other important
25 federal agencies, such as NOAA and National Marine

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Fisheries, that are helping you to focus on what the
2 key constraints are. I think that we can move ahead
3 and it's important that we do move ahead now.

4 I would finally add that I am helping to
5 draft more specific written comments on the draft PEIS
6 as a member of the offshore wind working group of the
7 American Wind Energy Association and I look forward to
8 presenting those comments, written comments, by the
9 deadline.

10 Thank you very much.

11 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

12 Next speaker, Mark Sinclair, Clean Energy
13 States Alliance.

14 MR. SINCLAIR: Good evening. I represent,
15 my name is Mark Sinclair and I represent a nonprofit
16 organization that works nationally on renewable energy
17 policy advocacy and finance issues. We filed comments
18 on the scoping document and we will be filing
19 comprehensive comments on the programmatic EIS.

20 I've got a couple of major points to
21 address in my limited time tonight. I think that it's
22 important, while the PEIS draft is a good first draft,
23 I think it's important for the MMS, in the final, to
24 try to identify specific policies and best management
25 practices that will guide your future regulations,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 much like the BLM did in its programmatic EIS for the
2 western lands and wind development.

3 I think it's important for the public to
4 understand what sort of standard policies and
5 practices you'll be expecting all developers to use,
6 it will streamline the regulatory process, it will
7 give the public an understanding of your regulatory
8 framework. So I would suggest that you list the major
9 policies and best management practices in your PEIS,
10 and let me give you an example of what I'm talking
11 about. For example, recommended policy would be that
12 you would not issue authorization for alternative
13 energy development on the OCS in areas in which the
14 development would be incompatible with specific
15 resource values, including areas of critical
16 environmental concern and marine protected areas, so
17 that would be a general policy that you would state in
18 the final PEIS that would govern all projects.

19 Another one would be, to the extent
20 possible, energy projects on the OCS would be
21 developed in a manner that does not prevent other
22 uses, and we'll be offering some of those policies in
23 our comments. In terms of best management practices,
24 these would be practices that are standard for every
25 developer to use, you would then go beyond those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 practices based on site specific project reviews, but
2 an example of a best management practice of the kind
3 we would recommend you state as standard operating
4 procedure would be that applicants identify important
5 sensitive or unique marine habitats in the vicinity of
6 a project and design the project to avoid, minimize or
7 mitigate those impacts, and require things like the
8 rigorous scientific evaluation of marine resources and
9 avian resources.

10 Again, BLM I think did a good job in their
11 programmatic EIS of laying out what policies and
12 practices they would use going forward. Also, I think
13 it's important that you address very clearly in the
14 final document that there are many impacts of
15 alternative energy on the OCS that are uncertain and
16 that there are limits to our ability to predict
17 impacts so that it's important for MMS to allow
18 initial projects to go forward with some uncertainty
19 and then use those projects to determine what the
20 actual impacts are, to come up with better mitigation
21 and to reduce uncertainty.

22 And to do that, I think, in the final EIS,
23 you ought to commit to the establishment of a national
24 research program and a research fund in which MMS and
25 other agencies with expertise would implement an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 ambitious environmental monitoring program and
2 baseline studies to help monitor conditions before,
3 during and after construction of the first offshore
4 projects. That kind of a program would establish a
5 reference for later analysis, to compare to the
6 existing environmental conditions and it would assist
7 developers with, the first developers with answering
8 the real questions we have out there. So I think MMS
9 should find resources to actually implement a national
10 monitoring and research program, much like they do in
11 the United Kingdom with their offshore program.

12 One additional recommendation would be
13 that you very clearly state that you are going to be
14 using adaptive management in terms of this program so
15 that these best management practices and regulations
16 should be changed over time, based on what you've
17 learned, beyond emphasize the adaptive management
18 approach and I think it makes good sense to inform
19 your program.

20 With that, I thank you for your time and
21 I'll be submitting additional comments before the
22 deadline. Thank you.

23 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

24 Our next speaker is Taber Allison,
25 Massachusetts Audubon.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ALLISON: Good evening. My name is
2 Taber Allison and I am here tonight representing Mass
3 Audobon, Mass Audobon is the largest conservation
4 organization in New England representing more than
5 100,000 members concentrating our efforts on
6 protecting the nature of Massachusetts for people and
7 wildlife.

8 We appreciate the opportunity to comment
9 tonight on the outer continental shelf alternative
10 energy and alternative use draft programmatic
11 environmental impact statement or PEIS. We understand
12 that the U.S. Department of Interior's Minerals
13 Management Service has prepared this draft PEIS to
14 support the establishment of a program that provides
15 for the efficient and orderly development of
16 alternative energy projects on the federal OCS, as
17 well as the alternate use of offshore facilities for
18 other energy and marine related activities. We also
19 observe that the draft PEIS takes a first look at the
20 potential environmental, social and economic impacts
21 from and mitigation measures for the activities that
22 could be initiated in the next five to seven years,
23 Mass Audobon supports both objectives.

24 Consistent with MMS's desire to establish
25 the alternative energy and alternative use program,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Mass Audobon has voluntarily and at the invitation of
2 MMS provided testimony in a variety of forums, we also
3 have direct experience in this matter, having
4 commented both orally and in writing on the first in
5 the nation offshore wind energy project, the Cape Wind
6 Energy Project, which includes both public comments as
7 well as independently collected data that we provided
8 to MMS for inclusion in the environmental review.

9 Also, as requested, we have provided to
10 MMS comments from Mass Audobon, the Nature Conservancy
11 and the Berkshire Natural Resources Council on the
12 Commonwealth of Massachusetts' unsuccessful attempts
13 to draft avian and bat guidance for onshore wind
14 energy facilities, lessons learned from this effort
15 can assist MMS in further its draft PEIS goals. Mass
16 Audobon intends to submit more detailed written
17 comments by the May deadline. Tonight though, to
18 emphasize, we agree with the PEIS that the magnitude
19 of many of the potential environmental impacts will
20 vary from site to site and region to region.

21 Consequently, we strongly recommend that
22 multiple year, comprehensive preconstruction site
23 assessments be conducted that provide a solid baseline
24 for assessment of environmental risk and
25 interpretation of post construction environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 impact.

2 And I would add a second to the comments
3 of the previous speaker, Mark Sinclair, about the
4 establishment of a comprehensive baseline monitoring
5 program, we think that's an excellent idea.

6 Mass Audubon, also in agreement with the
7 previous speaker, strongly recommends that an adaptive
8 management plan be a central and necessary component
9 to the permitting of wind energy facilities on the
10 OCS, an adaptive management plan for wind energy
11 facilities should include but not necessarily be
12 limited to the following requirements:

13 Sufficient, scientifically based baseline
14 data based on multiple years of observation on the
15 existing project area environment, as I described
16 earlier.

17 A comprehensive rigorous and
18 scientifically valid post construction monitoring
19 program that includes analysis of impacts on marine
20 and avian life beginning at the construction phase.

21 An independent scientific review panel
22 responsible for analyzing data collected during post
23 construction monitoring for making mitigation
24 recommendations based on this analysis, for preparing
25 reports for peer review and for disseminating the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 analysis and recommendations to relevant agencies, the
2 applicants and the public.

3 True mitigation measures in the event that
4 a project results in unavoidable adverse environmental
5 impacts, true mitigation measures would include
6 adjustments to operations and habitat conservation and
7 restoration projects intended to compensate for any
8 adverse environmental impacts of the project.

9 Project approval should also include
10 agency permit, license authorization and lease
11 adjustments, as necessary, over the life of the
12 project that will support mitigation, as described
13 previously. Baseline and post construction monitoring
14 and mitigation could be funded by the applicants,
15 supplemented with contributions from independent
16 institutions and government agencies, as appropriate.
17 Independent third parties should administer any
18 mitigation funds, mitigation funds should be used for
19 habitat conservation and restoration in and around the
20 project site.

21 We also recommend fair and adequate
22 compensation for the use of public lands and waters
23 and enforceable procedures for decommissioning any
24 abandoned facilities or facilities at the end of their
25 working life.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Thank you again for the opportunity to
2 comment, we look forward to your response in the final
3 programmatic EIS.

4 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

5 Our next speaker is Barbara Hill, Clean
6 Power Now.

7 MS. HILL: Good evening. My name is
8 Barbara Hill and I am the Executive Director of Clean
9 Power Now, a nonprofit grassroots organization based
10 in Hyannis, Massachusetts with over 7,000 members
11 whose mission is to inform, educate and empower
12 citizens to support viable renewable energy projects.
13 Thank you for providing us this opportunity to submit
14 testimony on the draft programmatic EIS.

15 In January of this year, an
16 interdisciplinary team of researchers from the
17 University of Delaware and Stanford University
18 published a peer reviewed wind power study which found
19 that the wind resource off the Mid-Atlantic Coast
20 could supply the energy needs of nine states, from
21 Massachusetts to North Carolina, plus the District of
22 Columbia, with enough left over to support a 50
23 percent increase in future energy demand. A recent
24 report from the intergovernmental panel on climate
25 change, whose final version is to be issued in Bangkok

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 on May 4th, says emissions can be cut below current
2 levels, if the world shifts away from carbon heavy
3 fuels, embraces energy efficiency and moves
4 aggressively towards use of renewable energy, "the
5 opportunities, the technology are there, and now it's
6 a case of encouraging the increased use of these
7 technologies".

8 Former Assistant Secretary for Energy
9 Efficiency and Renewable Energy David Garmin, in a
10 letter to the Army Corps of Engineers dated March 31,
11 2005 stated, and I quote: "utility-scale projects like
12 Cape Wind are important to our national interest and
13 a critical first step to building a domestic, globally
14 competitive wind industry". Success in this project
15 could also lay the foundation for a focused national
16 investment to develop offshore wind technology in the
17 coming years.

18 ISO New England, the not for profit
19 corporation responsible for the day to day operation
20 of New England's bulk energy generation and
21 transmission systems, has stated that we have a
22 critical need to diversify our energy portfolio and
23 they have warned us they don't know how we are going
24 to meet peak demand as early as 2008. If we are going
25 to be part of solving the urgent problems of climate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 change and energy independence, we need to act now.
2 We have an indigenous supply of inexhaustible
3 renewable energy right off our coast that our
4 children, we have a profound responsibility to tap for
5 our children and for the future.

6 We have already occurring global warming
7 and climate change and are starting to realize the
8 devastating effects. We have the potential for
9 economic opportunities around being world leaders in
10 a competitive global industry around renewables and we
11 have a critical need to diversify our energy portfolio
12 in New England due to a dangerously high dependence on
13 natural gas. I implore you to not delay any further
14 the authority given to you by the Energy Policy Act of
15 2005 and put in place the regulations for alternative
16 energy activities on the outer continental shelf in
17 order to facilitate faster development of this energy
18 industry, there is a growing urgency and your work is
19 critical.

20 Thank you very much.

21 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

22 Our next speaker is Cynthia Liebman,
23 Conservation Law Foundation.

24 MS. LIEBMAN: Hello. My name is Cynthia
25 Liebman and I am a staff attorney at the Conservation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Law Foundation. The Conservation Law Foundation,
2 known as CLF, is a nonprofit organization that works
3 to protect the environment and communities in New
4 England, CLF supports responsibly sited, clean
5 renewable energy and energy efficiency as the best
6 ways to meet our energy needs while protecting
7 ecosystems and human health.

8 The backdrop for this discussion, as
9 others have mentioned, is climate change and also the
10 mandate in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 for MMS to
11 establish regulations on a short timeline of 270 days
12 governing offshore alternative energy uses.

13 We appreciate the effort that MMS has put
14 into this environmental review to date and expect the
15 agency will continue to move forward with all
16 deliberate speed on the final EIS and the rule making.
17 I'll offer two specific comments on the draft EIS.
18 First, climate change should be discussed and factored
19 into the EIS analysis, both in describing the current
20 state of marine and coastal environments and in
21 analyzing the impacts of each alternative. There is
22 evidence that the world's ocean ecosystems are being
23 significantly affected by climate change through sea
24 level rise, acidification, changes in salinity,
25 temperature and ocean currents. And I'll point to a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CLF report called "Oceans in Peril" which compiles a
2 lot of other studies on ocean climate change impacts.

3 MMS should augment the EIS to better
4 reflect what is already known about how climate is
5 effecting each coastal region and explain the changes
6 that scientists expect to see in the future. MMS
7 should also discuss the effects of each of the
8 proposed alternatives in light of climate change
9 impacts.

10 Second, MMS should establish consistent
11 protocols for preconstruction studies and post
12 constructive adaptive management. The benefit, as
13 others have discussed, of these programmatic
14 regulations will be to establish guidelines and
15 expectations for project proponents and for the public
16 to know what to expect.

17 Careful consideration of the siting of
18 each offshore facility is essential, as are best
19 management practices, or BMPs, for mitigating its
20 impacts at all stages of the project life cycle, so
21 the discussion and listing of BMPs in this draft EIS
22 is a good step towards this goal and CLF supports the
23 inclusion of such BMPs in the programmatic
24 regulations. However, even with these best management
25 practices in place, there will be unknowns specific to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 each project. Therefore, in order to ensure the
2 protection of marine habitat, while also allowing
3 these projects to move forward in an economically
4 viable pace, CLF suggests that the regulations rely
5 not just on up front study and prediction of impacts
6 but also on rigorous adaptive management protocols to
7 address the unknown factors. Adaptive management
8 should be used to preserve the option of making
9 changes to a project to mitigate unexpected or unknown
10 impacts after construction has begun.

11 Finally, CLF would like to echo the
12 importance of the Cape Wind EIS moving forward in
13 parallel with this process.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

16 Our next speaker is Catherine Maas,
17 Healthlink.

18 MS. MAAS: Hi. I'm Catherine Maas and I
19 represent Healthlink which is a grassroots
20 environmental group living in the shadow of the Salem
21 Harbor generating station which is a dirty coal and
22 oil fueled power plant. And we have been working for
23 eight and a half years to reduce the amount of toxic
24 emissions from this plant and, although landmark state
25 regulations were passed in 2001 and the plant is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 running somewhat cleaner, the owners have not begun to
2 deal with the mercury or greenhouse gasses emitted, so
3 our voluntary group spends enormous time and energy
4 monitoring the plant's compliance with the regulations
5 and the specific interpretations of the regulations.

6 And Healthlink is here to speak in favor
7 of moving this permitting process and Cape Wind along,
8 it has been six years that this company has been
9 dealing with the process, six years, and it is really
10 hard not to compare this to the one-year permitting
11 process for offshore LNG chemical factories which have
12 much more impact on the sea around them and much more
13 possibility for disaster, so we are here to urge you
14 to expedite this process, it is inexcusable to lose
15 the opportunity to site America's first offshore wind
16 farm in our state.

17 We need the jobs it would provide, we need
18 to be able to breath the clean air it would foster, we
19 need energy independence and we really feel that there
20 is no excuse to delay this project, as it has already
21 been delayed too long, so the time for action is
22 really now. You know, the public is awakening to the
23 problems of global warming and we have reached the
24 tipping point in public consciousness, so there is new
25 energy for solutions and the public knows that what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 they do personally is just one part of the answer, the
2 solution is so much larger and our government must
3 lead us into a sustainable future with clean,
4 renewable energy and we really feel that we must do it
5 now.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

8 Okay, we have reached the end of the list
9 of registered speakers, is there anybody else who
10 would like to offer comments tonight?

11 Yes, sir?

12 MR. DOWD: Hi. I'm Phillip Dowd, speaking
13 for the Sierra Club of Massachusetts tonight. I
14 didn't know I was going to speak but I thought of a
15 couple of things.

16 The U.S. uses about 100 quads, that is 100
17 quadrillion BTUs a year of energy. Of that, about 85
18 quads comes from fossil fuel combustion. The emerging
19 consensus is that if we are going to escape and evade
20 climate change progressing from the merely difficult
21 into the truly catastrophic, we need to eliminate
22 about 80 percent of that fossil fuel combustion by mid
23 century, that is 66 quadrillion BTUs of fossil fuel
24 combustion to retire over the next, say, 45 years.

25 Some of this retirement, if we can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 succeed, is going to come from the demand reduction
2 side of the equation from energy conservation and
3 energy efficiency technologies, but much of it is
4 going to come from the substitution of clean energy
5 alternatives. If we have only a modest goal of one
6 third of the retirement, let's just say 22 quadrillion
7 BTUs of energy retired from fossil fuels, replaced by
8 alternative sources, and if, as many experts believe,
9 our best shot at alternative sources is wind power,
10 that means that this nation needs literally thousands
11 and thousands of projects, wind farm projects of the
12 size of the project not being discussed tonight.

13 We hope that MMS can help us figure out
14 where to put these thousands of projects and we hope
15 that you will do it sooner rather than later.

16 Thank you so much.

17 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

18 Is there anyone else? Yes, sir?

19 MR. PALANO: Thank you for allowing us to
20 speak tonight. My name is Gerry Palano, I'm from
21 Acton, Mass and just a private citizen, a professional
22 engineer.

23 And I would like to laud you for your
24 efforts to date on your draft environmental impact
25 statement and emphasize the need to move forward as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 fast as we can. We listened to all our other
2 speakers, I believe we are on the brink of disaster,
3 we have waited too long. I know I have waited just
4 about my whole lifetime to see some change to the way
5 we produce power and energy in this country and in
6 this world.

7 I would like to ask you to also keep in
8 mind that whatever regulations or procedures you ask
9 to be implemented in the statement that you also keep
10 in mind the cost and the impact of the cost on those
11 who would be involved, so it doesn't necessarily
12 mandate adding unnecessary cost to the ultimate end
13 user of those projects and make them financially
14 unfeasible. I was involved in a lot of the demand
15 side management programs that the utilities were
16 involved with and found, and ultimately we all found
17 some of their measurement verification procedures were
18 ridiculously costly and cost the rate payers of all of
19 these utilities unnecessary dollars.

20 And those in a, you talk about follow up
21 programs, impact programs to see what the true results
22 are, one of the prime conclusions were that we were
23 over-measuring and over-verifying that a 30 watt
24 compact fluorescent actually consumes 30 watts of
25 energy compares to a 100 watt incandescent, so keep in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 mind, please, the cost of what this takes so we can
2 make this process as simple as possible.

3 And with all due respect for those who
4 always seem to be on the opposite side of moving
5 forward with new technologies, I would like to add
6 that I firmly believe that these new technologies that
7 you've been mandated to oversee and initiate are
8 different from what we all grew up with in that they
9 are all in harmony with the world, all in harmony with
10 nature, and that the worst impact, I think, if we do
11 make a mistake, and move forward and get some projects
12 underway, is going to be localized, it's not going to
13 be significantly universal, such as the greenhouse
14 gasses or the radioactivity spills that we have also
15 experienced, and so the worst mistake we can make is
16 going to be something local.

17 And I find it kind of funny, as I listen
18 to all those who seem to be opposed to moving ahead
19 with these technologies and the analogy that keeps
20 sticking in my head is we are going from power mowers,
21 sit down mowers to push mowers and we are taking this
22 incredible assessment of what the economic or
23 environmental impacts are going to be going to
24 something that's just that much less energy intensive
25 in the long run.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Thank you.

2 MR. GASPER: Thank you.

3 Anyone else?

4 Well, if not, thank you again for coming
5 tonight and we'll declare this meeting officially
6 over. Thank you.

7 (Whereupon, at 8:20 p.m., the hearing was
8 concluded.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25